

REMARKS

Applicant has studied the Final Office Action dated February 1, 2008. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 21, and 22 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 17, and 19 have been amended and claim 22 has been newly added. Claims 1, 5, 17, and 19 are independent claims. No new matter has been added as the amendments have support in the specification as originally filed.

It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Claim for Foreign Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

The Examiner acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(b) and indicated receipt of a certified copy of the priority document at page 2 of the Office action. However, it is respectfully noted that not all applicable boxes have been checked to indicate that the certified copy of the priority document has been received under Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 on the Office Action Summary page. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner properly check all applicable boxes by checking box 1 for 'Certified copies of the priority documents have been received' in addition to boxes 12) and a).

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 17, and 19 have been amended to more clearly disclose the invention. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments have support in the application as originally filed. In particular, support for amendments to independent claims 1, 17, and 19 can be found at page 14 of the specification as originally filed and FIG. 5.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 17, 19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagaoka et al. ("Nagaoka" U.S. App. 2002/0180579 A1). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Nagaoka and respectfully traverses the rejection.

It is respectfully noted that a proper rejection for anticipation under § 102 requires complete identity of invention. The claimed invention, including each element thereof as recited in the claims, must be disclosed or embodied, either expressly or inherently, in a single reference. Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc., 953 F.2d 1360, 1369, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner asserts, at paragraphs 6-8 of the Office action, that Nagaoka discloses the present invention as recited in independent claims 1, 17, and 19. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. Nevertheless, it is respectfully noted that independent claims 1, 17, and 19 have been amended with this paper to further distinguish the present invention from the cited reference and to expedite prosecution of the present application.

It is respectfully submitted that Nagaoka clearly fails to disclose or suggest that service requests from the remote access service unit are stored in an order received and processed in a UPnP service request queue and a service request being processed has been saved in a service request table, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 17, and 19. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1, 17, and 19 are allowable over the cited reference. It is further respectfully asserted that claims 2 and 21, which depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively, also are allowable over the cited reference.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaoka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully asserted that claims 3 and 4 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies upon patentable independent claim 1.

Claims 5-7 and 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagaoka in view of Baba et al. ("Baba" U.S. Patent 5,758,057). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 5, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner asserts, at paragraph 12 of the Office action, that Nagaoka discloses “wherein the remote access service unit includes a profile database,” citing paragraphs 0186 and 0195. However, Applicant’s review of the cited portions reveals disclosure of performing presetting program recording in a video recorder (paragraph 0186) and control completion information for showing that the control designated by control instruction CI1 is performed (paragraph 0195). It appears that the “control completion information” disclosed in Nagaoka was interpreted by the Examiner to be analogous to the profile database as recited in independent claim 5. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s assertion, “once the instructions are complete, the network management server receives the control complete information and transfers that info to the HTTP server; then web data is sent to the user terminal **displaying that the request was completed and the status of the home-located device after completion of the request**” is not related to the profile database as recited in independent claim 5.

It is further respectfully noted that the Examiner asserts that Nagaoka discloses “performance of the remote access terminal including a screen size and a type of an input device,” citing Fig. 8 and “remote access terminal performance information correlates to terminal ID is user profile.” However, it is respectfully submitted that the cited portion of Nagaoka fails to disclose or suggest performance of the remote access terminal including a screen size and a type of an input device, as recited in independent claim 5.

Furthermore, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner asserts that Nagaoka discloses “network provider’s network bandwidth and services available from the provider,” citing paragraphs 0012-0016 and 0085. However, despite the Examiner’s assertion that “the types of services depend on the type of network,” upon Applicant’s review of the cited portion of Nagaoka, it is respectfully submitted that Nagaoka fails to disclose or suggest a profile database comprising network provider’s network bandwidth and services available from the provider, as recited in independent claim 5.

Moreover, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner asserts that Baba discloses the use of establishing priority levels for multiple users that determine priority of access

to each device in a system with multiple devices, citing Fig. 1 and col. 8, lines 31-42. In addition, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner asserts that it was well known to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to expand the user profile database to include a list of devices preferred by the user and a list of requested events, as recited in independent claim 5, without citing any references.

Applicant's review of Baba discloses a multi-media storage system having a plurality of disk drives. In particular, it is respectfully noted that the cited portion of Baba discloses avoiding waiting for access to the storage when a plurality of users access the storage by predetermining a priority of the users to access a specific disk drive.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Baba, which merely discloses accessing a multi-media storage system, fails cure the above-identified deficiencies of Nagaoka with regard to independent claim 5. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that independent claim 5 is allowable over Nagaoka and Baba. It is further respectfully asserted that claims 6, 7, and 9-16, which depend from independent claim 5, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependencies upon patentable base claim 5.

New Claim

With this paper, new claim 22 has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the new claim has support in the application as originally filed. Support for claim 22 can be found, for example, on pages 14-15 of the specification and Fig. 5.

Since claim 22 depends from allowable independent claim 1 and it is believed that the features recited in claim 22 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, it is respectfully asserted that claim 22 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-7, 9-17, 19, 21, and 22 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as originally filed, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

By:



Richard C. Salfelder
Registration No. 51,127
Attorney for Applicant

Date: April 30, 2008

Customer No. 035884